

the *Saturday Rambler* (American paper) has
its readers a task, viz., to find the command-
ment thougout," in the Bible. A corrector
of the *Philadelphia Morning Post* has found it
in the 8th chapter, 10th verse.

LETTERS
TO THE WORKING CLASSES.

LXXXIII.

"We are things, and a small drop of ink
Falling like dew—upon a thought, produces
That which makes thousands, perhaps millions
think."

IRELAND'S APPEAL TO THE BRITISH
DEMOCRACY.LOUIS NAPOLEON AND THE "QUIET
AND MODERATE" MEN OF "ORDER."

BROTHER PROLETARIANS.

The darkest hour is nearest to the dawn.
Famine and pestilence wrapt Ireland in a
funeral pall. The apathy which permitted
the sacrifice of gloom of death the darkness of
despair. But behold! "a bright particular
star"—the Aurora of a happier day is bursting
through the sombre night of desolation. A
few months ago the heart-sunk in hopelessness,
in contemplating the fallen and degraded state
of Ireland. Now hope is rapidly taking the
place of despondency. That bright luminary
the *Irishman* has arisen, and is shedding light
and life around. It is at once the redoubt
and the reviver of Irish Democracy; the morn-
ing star (let us hope) of Ireland's day of re-
demption.

To the genuine lover of Freedom, no duty
is more pressing than that of acknowledging
and extolling the fraternal services of other
democrats. As one, whose mission it is to speak
for, as well as to, the British democracy, I
deem it incumbent to take notice of the ad-
mirable addresses from the *Irishman* to the
democrats of Britain, reprinted, the first in last
Saturday's *Northern Star*, and the second in
the current number.

Those addresses prove, firstly,—that the
spirit of veritable democracy is obtaining pos-
session of our Irish brethren; and, secondly,—
that all the efforts of English tyrants on the
one hand, and Irish impostors, like the O'Con-
nells, on the other—have failed to prevent the
growth of that sentiment which must ever
spring from true democracy—Fraternity.

Until now, a main feature in Irish agitation,
has been the incantation of hatred of the En-
glish without distinction. It was the boast of
the Irish Mook that Irish soldiers shot
down English Chartists at Newport; and it
was his vaunt that "five hundred thousand
Tipperary boys" were ready, if needed, to put
down the Radical-revolutionists of England.
Every attempt on the part of the English de-
mocrats to unite the suffering millions of the
two nations, encountered from O'CONNELL and
his satellites the fiercest hostility, and most
violent denunciation. On his trial, the great
impostor even made it matter for boasting that
he had prevented the fraternisation of the
"loyal Irish" with the English Chartists.

How different is the course pursued by the men
who at present are devoting their services to,
and perilling so much to Ireland's cause.
They draw a just distinction between the British
people and the tyrants who plunder and
oppress the millions of both countries. They
deplore that the physical strength of the two
peoples has been arrayed against each other,
or when combined has been so, to promote the
aggrandisement of the common enemy. They
desire to unite the two nations, that each aid-
ing the other may succeed in breaking the
chains of Saxon and of Celt.

Surely, the soul-stirring addresses of the
Irishman will not have been made in vain. It
is the duty of the British Democracy to re-
spond, less by words than by deeds. If the
telling millions of Britain feel sympathy for
their wronged Irish brethren—if they feel in-
dignant at their own sufferings—they will
grasp at the hand proffered to them in the
spirit of brotherhood, and swear, by their
common wrongs, to march shoulder to shoulder
—a united phalanx—against oppressors
who have so long misgoverned both countries,
and plundered and enslaved the people of both
islands.

Yes, plundered and enslaved are the down-
trodden millions of both Ireland and Britain.
In the *Irishman* of Saturday last, it is stated,
on the authority of a Report compiled by
Major LAMBORN, that, in the time of the recent
"famine," there was produced in Ireland a
sufficiency of grain to have supplied the whole
of the inhabitants with a year's consumption,
and to have left a surplus of ninety-seven
pounds weight, for every man, woman, and
child in the island. Yet, in spite of this su-
perabundance, the miserable people perished
of hunger, and rotted to death, to the number
of hundreds of thousands. The well-fed hy-
pocrites in Parliament, and elsewhere, asserted,
that the famine was "a visitation of Divine
Providence"—the truth being, that the famine
was caused by no extraordinary visitation of
any kind, but, by the system of permanent
plunder, established for the benefit of land-
lords and capitalists. Similar results are pro-
duced by a similar state of things in this
country. The people raise the corn, but they
cannot get a sufficiency of bread. They rear
the cattle, yet thousands of them never
taste flesh meat. They build mansions
and palaces, and are glad to shelter
themselves in hovels, garrets, and cellars.
They perform the dreadful la-
bour of digging through the bowels of the
earth for coal, yet how many of their class
never know the comfort of a stove-full of
fire! They weave silks, broad-cloths, and
linens, yet rags, or at best the coarsest clothing
is the outward and visible sign of their al-
liance to Labour! They traverse distant
seas to bring home wines, teas, coffee, spices,
and innumerable luxuries, yet the best and the
most of these products of distant lands are
consumed by idlers and plunderers who never
braved the dangers of the deep and the hard-
ships of the storm. Amongst the wealth-pro-
ducers poverty abounds, and the labour which
supplies so many enjoyments fails to confer
them on the labourers. The greatness of the
nation has been built up by the toil and he-
roism of the many, but the few have contrived
to monopolise the advantages and the glory of
Britain's Empire "on which the sun never
sets." The words of TIBERIUS GRACCHUS,
though uttered two thousand years ago, apply
strictly to the present condition of the great
mass of Britain's defenders on food and field.

"The private soldiers fight and die to in-
crease the wealth and luxury of the great, and
they are styled rulers of the world, while they
have not a foot of ground which they can call
their own." Slavery accompanies poverty.
The people who have no voice in forming the
laws they are compelled to submit to, whose
industry is taxed by irresponsible rulers, and
who are compelled by hunger to work on any
terms the master-classes may dictate, are
slaves. He who works for the profit of
another, and is denied the enjoyment of rights
secured to his fellow, is a *bondman* and a
slave. And such is the state of the veritable
people of this country.

The entire system is one of organized vil-
lany, and to reform it altogether should be
the stern resolve of every true man. In these
islands all the elements of happiness abound;
and if hitherto those blessings have been mo-
rely by the idle and the rapacious, the
people themselves. An earnest and general
effort for their own redemption would result
in victory. Until when is that effort to be
delayed?

For earnest men, the "good time" of la-
bour and struggle in the war against injustice
is ever now. Now, then, let England's re-
sponse be made to the appeals of the *Irishman*.
Let the British Democracy commence the
work of organization in good earnest. "Where
there is a will there is a way." Inaction would
do no exist. The plea that the people
themselves are contented, must be taken from
those who profit by the existing system.

The organ of our Democratic Brethren
across St. George's Channel, is a paper which
should be read wherever British Democrats
congregate. It exhibits talent equal to that
of the *Nation* in its best days, with this ad-
ditional claim on British support—that though
breathing fervent aspiration for Ireland's re-
generation, it wages no war against Britain's
people; on the contrary, it desires—to quote
its own language—to "weave together the
rose and shamrock—the one no longer tyranni-
cal, the other oppressed. To grave on one
shield 'the rights of liberty, of labour, and of
man.' And to twine together the banners,
green and red, in one thick cord, to bind
down for ever the demon that has op-
pressed us."

All individual Democrats who can afford to
purchase the *Irishman* should do so. All or-
ganised bodies of Democrats will do so, if they
desire to learn the sentiments, and note the
progress of their Irish brethren. There is no
paper that has higher, holier claims on the
people of both countries than the talented,
earnest, and thoroughly democratic *Irishman*.

Of French affairs a cursory notice, this
week, will suffice. In dealing with the dis-
puted electoral returns for the department of
the Haut Rhin, the circumstances connected
with which being similar to those at the elec-
tion of the Seine-et-Loire, the majority in the
Assembly has given another illustration of
"Moderate" equity. The Members elected
for the Haut Rhin being Ordermongers their
election has been voted legal, while the major-
ity had previously unseated the Members for
the Seine-et-Loire. Why? Because they were
Socialist-Democrats. The Government is
pushing forward the Bill to Transport to the
Marquesa Islands BARRES, BLANQUI,
RASPAUL, and other Revolutionary Chiefs
condemned for the affair of May 1848,
and June 1849. The Ordermongers seem
determined to establish some excellent prece-
dents, which may be made to apply to them-
selves hereafter. The "Special" Chief of the
gangs has heard the warning note of popular
vengeance. Returning from Vincennes to the
Elysée, the imperial ape had to pass
through the Faubourg St. Antoine, where, to
his dismay, his ears were assailed with cries of
"Vive la République—democratie et so-
cial!" "A bas le tyran!" "Les hommes
nuds armés, shoot their clenched fists in the
face of the "zephew of my uncle, at the
same time exclaiming: "We will only have
the Republic!" The Times assurance that
"there are few who do not believe that the
authorities are perfectly competent to suppress
any attempt at disturbance." He signifi-
cantly adds:—"So strong is this feeling, that
there are very moderate and quiet men who
think that an *enquete* would be so far
fortunate that it would decide many a dis-
agreeable question for a long time. Of that,
however, I do not learn there is any chance
at this moment." What a pity! You ob-
serve, Brother Proletarians, that there are
some "very moderate and quiet men,"
who would like a little insurrection—an un-
successful revolt, so that they might have the
pleasure of massacring the Proletarians, and
making a St. BARTHOLOMEW of all known
Red Republicans. Of course these quiet and
moderate aristocrats, bankers, and men of
property, would not do the killing themselves,
they would employ butchers for the purpose.
But why blame these interesting traffickers in
human lives? They are only true to "their
own convictions, ideas, and opinions," and
you know it is declared, on high authority,
that "men who are true to their own thoughts
are true to the world as they see it."

Vive la Hungry!

Yes, they believe the world was made for
their paradise and for your hell. They are
true to the conviction, idea, and opinion, that
it is their sovereign right to use up the la-
bourer purely for their own profit, and should
he rebel, to slay him without pity or remorse.
But that is not "private assassination," it is
only murder according to law, and of course
Citizen Cuvier is content. What, though
millions suffer, and thousands are destroyed,
as long as "property" is secured, and "order"
maintained? Let us hope, Brother Proletarians,
that there will be no insurrection in
France until the people are sure of victory;
and let us hope, too, that in the event of the
people being forced to combat against their
tyrants, that (notwithstanding *Chen's* horror)
the "quiet and moderate" men, who are just
now thirsting for the people's blood, will have
their thirst allayed after a fashion they would
least desire.

L'AMI DU PEUPLE.

April 11, 1850.

TO THE DEMOCRATS OF GREAT BRITAIN.
(From the *Irishman* of April 6th.)

BROTHER DEMOCRATS.—In our last we placed
at the ungracious and insulting mode in which
the Constitution—the boasted, ideal, unwritten,
and non-existent Constitution of England—had
been sealed against your entrance. It is a "holy
of holies," into which none of the vulgar mass
of the people, but the high-priests of the or-
der, dally sprinkled with the blood of a strug-
gling people.

The insult is not a bootless one—the depri-
vation of privilege is not a bare sentimental
deprivation of right—it is an actual, solid, and
material deprivation. For there is a moral, a
level, like a Sodom, the enormous fabric of the
British Empire, and sadder to the four winds
of heaven the elements of the tyrannical and un-
yielding fabric. At the present day, it crushes you—made
in God's image—into the mere brute; into a base
and hopeless struggle for a morsel of food. On
you go, from week to week, tolling, like Hood's
siren, "in misery, hunger, and dirt."

Will you go on submitting to a revolution—the
first stone was laid in successful revolt; and the
wings and keels of the great feudal dragon, that
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection. Why, then,
should you bow your necks like slaves to the
crumpled rails of a dismounted cannon? The
willing yoke? For there is no yoke of allegiance; it
oppresses us all, and throws its black shadow
over the broad woods of North America, and to
the mountain tops of Central India, were built
up by repeated acts of insurrection.

to have been caused by gunshot wounds, the

completely destroyed a portion of the abductees.—Mr. Townsend, Q.C., defended the prisoner, and the learned Judge, having summed up the case, in the course of which he took occasion to condemn the use of such parties as the prisoner had used as weapons for the perpetration of the jury found the prisoner "Not Guilty."

NORWICH.

ASSAULT.—Robert Willmont, aged 21, was indicted for wounding James Ems, while in the execution of his duty as a police-constable, on the 10th of January, 1848.—Mr. Power presented an affidavit on behalf of the prisoner, and Mr. William Cooper defended the prisoner.—It appeared that the prisoner was intruded, in 1847, into the house of the prisoner's father, and was ordered to apprehend the prisoner on a charge of felony, which they repaired to his father's house at past eight o'clock on the night of the 10th of January, 1848, and finding the garden gate locked, they climbed over the fence and rapped at the door.—The prisoner also fastened the door, and a little interval old Mr. Willmont opened a chamber window, and asked who was there.—Ems was wanted. Ems replied, "I want you Robert;" but being politely told that "he was gone and he—" for he should not have his son that night," the policeman insisted on admission; and the prisoner, seeing that he could not prevent it, as they would come down and see it, he then withdrew his head, and the officers of the law waited patiently for some ten minutes. At the lapse of that time they repeated their summons, receiving no answer, broke open the door, rushed upstairs, and found the prisoner. They entered them with a crowbar with a light in his hand, and inside the door, and a brother of the prisoner went up the stairs with a stick. Ems passed the stick to the policeman, who struck the prisoner a tremendous blow on the head from the prisoner who laid about most vigorously with a stick to break down the door. The effect of this was to bring him down and the prisoner was staggering and falling, and the prisoner's brother knocked him down to the ground with his stick. This done the whole family seem to have decamped, leaving Robert to call his disabled companion to Norwich Hospital as he was taken.—Mr. Cooper, in addressing the jury, said that the prisoner was a prisoner, when he was taken on this charge, denied all knowledge of the prosecutor, and asserted that he took him in as a housebreaker rather than an officer of justice charged to keep the peace.—Mr. Justice Wightman left it to the jury to say whether they attached credence to this statement, and the jury found the prisoner guilty of the charge, and sentenced him to be transported for ten years;—offence appearing to him to be one which called for the most severe punishment.

THE DISS BARK ROBERT.—The prisoners and Senior, who had confessed themselves guilty of the offence of being drunk, were taken up by the Lord Chief Baron to receive judgment.—The Lord Chief Baron, in pronouncing judgment, in addressing the prisoners, said that John Rix and Henry Senior, you stand convicted upon admissions made by yourselves on a trial, that you were guilty of the offence charged upon you. You were, however, at the very moment of your confession, or the admission, very strongly recommended to mercy by the prosecutor who professed to have no ill will towards either

[illegible][illegible]

Central Criminal Court.

The April session of the above court commenced on Monday morning before the Lord Mayor, the Recorder, Aldermen Sir G. Carroll, Pinnis, Challis, Carden, &c.

There are the names of 212 prisoners for trial on the calendar.

CHARGES AGAINST A CLERGYMAN.—Richard Child Willis, an elderly person of gentlemanly appearance, surrendered to take his trial upon an indictment for a misdemeanour.—Mr. Ballantine indicted for a misdemeanour, in his address to the defendant, Mr. Willis, said he regretted very much to be compelled to prosecute a person in the position of the prisoner who, he believed, was a clergyman of the Church of England, for an offence of this description, but at the same time he was afraid that when they had the facts of the case it would be impossible for them to come to any other conclusion than that the offence with which the prisoner was charged was clearly made out.—Mr. W. Smith deposed that he was a wine merchant, carrying on business in the Leicester-square, and was the father of the prisoner. On the 12th of February, 1849, the prisoner produced a cheque for £2 upon Messrs. Drummond and Co., signed by himself, and asked him to cash it, and he accordingly gave him the money to cash it, and the cheque was presented, and it turned out that the prisoner had no account at the bank.

By Mr. Parry: Had known the prisoner for some years, and was on very friendly terms with him.

If he had asked him to lend him his money, he should certainly have done so.—Mr. John Cox, cashier, at Messrs. Drummond's, deposed that the prisoner kept no account at their house, and when the cheque in question was presented he was not upon it to that effect.—By Mr. Parry: He knew that the prisoner kept no account with the bank, from having himself asked him to submit the cheque to himself, and Mr. Parry books. The books were not submitted, but he had submitted that the prisoner ought to have produced a cheque.

Mr. Ballantine contended that there was quite sufficient *prima facie* evidence to go to the jury. If the books had been produced they would only prove a non-existing fact, which was quite as clearly established by the evidence of the witness.—The Recorder said the case must go to the jury.—Mr. Parry accordingly addressed them for the defence. He said he was sure they would not blame him for endeavouring to rescue the unfortunate gentleman at the bar, who had been truly described by his learned friend as a clergyman of the Church of England, from the degrading position in which he stood at the present moment.

The learned counsel then remarked upon the circumstances under which the prisoner, the prosecutor, would have lent the prisoner the money if he had asked him, without the cheque being produced, if they could find ground for reasonable doubt as to the intention of the prisoner, that he would give him the benefit of that doubt, and acquit him.—The Recorder having summed up, the jury deliberated for a short time, and they then wished to be informed of the reason why the charge had not been brought forward before the present time.—Mr. Ballantine said the prosecutor was not desirous to prefer any charge. The prisoner was in custody upon some other matter, and Mr. Smith was summoned by the magistrate.—The prosecutor was recalled, and, in answer to a question put by the court, he said he did not send the prisoner from the court when the offence was committed, but he was in custody; but he might have done so if he had pleased.—The jury, after a short further deliberation, returned a verdict of "Not Guilty."

ROBBERY IN A DWELLING-HOUSE.—Benjamin Davis, aged 20, was indicted for stealing in the dwelling-house of William Layman Cowan, three brooches, valued at £3, his property.—It appeared that the prosecutor, who is secretary to the Shropshire Union Railway Company, resided on the second floor of some chambers, No. 2, Great George-street, Westminster, and the property was stolen from the apartments on the 6th of February.—The evidence being insufficient as to the prisoner's identity, the jury acquitted him.—The prisoner was again indicted for stealing a silver fork, the property of the same prosecutor.—The jury found the prisoner "Guilty" on this charge.—The Common Sergeant sentenced him to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for twelve months.

CHARGE OF EMBEZZLEMENT.—John Gregory, 28, stationer, was indicted for embezzling the sum of £4 1s. the monies of John Thomas Smith and another, his masters.—The jury acquitted the prisoner.

UTTERING A FORGED ACCEPTANCE.—George Lyon, 32, clerk, pleaded "Guilty" to two indictments charging him with uttering a forged bill of exchange, with intent to defraud William Miller Christie and others.—Judgment was postponed.

THE ARGYLE ROBBERY.—This case is postponed until the next sessions, in order to know the result of an indictment removed by *certiorari* to the Queen's Bench.

A WIFE KILLED BY HER HUSBAND.—Alexander Lovey, 43, gunsmith, was indicted for the wilful murder of Charlotte Lovey, his wife, by stabbing her in the neck with a knife. The prisoner by the coroner's inquisition was charged with the offence of manslaughter only.—Mr. Clarkson conducted the prosecution by direction of the court. The prisoner was defended by Mr. Parry, through the humane intervention of the Sheriff.—The learned counsel having briefly opened the case for the prosecution, the following evidence was adduced in support of the charge.—John Woolcot deposed that he lived at No. 15, Crown-court, Whitechapel. He knew the prisoner, who is a gunmaker, and was at work for him on the day when this occurrence happened, in February last. The prisoner and the deceased lived at No. 4, Boars'-Head-court, Whitechapel. On Tuesday, the 19th of February, the deceased went out in the early part of the day. He and the deceased had a quarrel the same evening, and the deceased did not return home until about dusk, and the prisoner then asked her where she had been, and she replied that she had been at her mother's. The prisoner then said if she had been there, they would have a comfortable tea, and he added that he would give her a drop of wine if she would be comfortable with him. The deceased told him to fetch the wine, and the prisoner took a stone bottle and went out as she desired, and he came back with the wine and some meat also—a sweetbread. Deceased took the stone bottle, and poured some of the wine into a tea-cup, and drank it, and while the prisoner was engaged frying the sweetbread, with a knife in his hand, the deceased told him she had been up to the court to get a warrant out against him.

He said with an oath, "You want to wear my life away," and immediately stuck the knife in her, close to her breast and shoulder. He stabbed her once. The deceased cried out "He has stabbed me," and ran into the street. At the time the prisoner stabbed her she was sitting against the fire-place, in a chair. Witness followed the deceased into the street, and saw her taken to a doctor's shop near Petticoat-lane. There was a great deal of blood in the street that had flowed from her person. Witness accompanied a police sergeant back to the prisoner's house, and found him sitting by the fire, in the act of finishing his tea, and witness pointed him to the sergeant, and he took him into custody. He was using the knife he stabbed the deceased with to cut bread, and the sergeant took that away also. There had been a deal of quarrelling between the prisoner and the deceased the same morning, and he saw the latter sharpening the knife in question upon an earthenware pan, and she said she was going to cut her throat. The prisoner said, "Do it," and then took the knife away from her. She was a sober woman.—Mr. Thomas Wyatt deposed that he was house surgeon at the London Hospital, and he remembered the deceased being brought there on the evening of the 19th of February. Upon examining her he ascertained that she was bleeding from a wound on the right side of the neck, and was in a state of partial collapse, and much exhausted. It was a punctured wound, and such a one as would be produced by the knife in the hands of a person of the size of the prisoner. The wound was about three quarters of an inch long, and three inches deep. At first he did not consider that the wound was mortal. The deceased lingered from the 19th to the 27th of February, and then died. Her death was occasioned by inflammation, caused by the wound. Upon a post mortem examination, he found that the gullet had been completely transfixed, and the knife had passed through to the other side, and had passed so close to the carotid artery that its pulsation was visible.—Several witnesses were examined, and a statement made by the deceased was read, which confirmed the evidence already given.—The jury, after deliberating for five minutes, returned their verdict, finding the prisoner "Guilty" of manslaughter.—Mr. Justice Erle ordered the prisoner to stand down, and said he would consider what sentence ought to be pronounced upon him.

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT.—Charles Cartwright, 25, was indicted for feloniously cutting and wounding Daniel May, with intent to resist his lawful apprehension. It appeared that May, who is a City

proceeded to explain, that although these companies are not carrying passengers, so far as the business of carrying passengers was concerned, yet, for the saving of expense, and with a view to prevent rivalry, which might be dangerous and inconvenient to the public, they arranged that at several places or landing places, ticket agents should be employed to deliver and receive the tickets from the passengers. The fraud imputed to the defendants was, that by collusion with each other and other persons, after a ticket had been issued at London-bridge, or any other station, the same ticket, after it was given up by the passenger at the end of the journey, was returned to the original station and re-issued—this system of fraud, according to the case for the prosecution, being carried on to a very great extent, and occasioning serious loss to the companies. It appeared that the alleged fraud was discovered in rather an accidental manner, from the circumstances of a gentleman, named Oldfield, being acquainted with one of the directors, taking notice that the ticket which was given to him at the City pier appeared very crumpled; and this exciting his suspicion, he retained the ticket, and having communicated with the company, inquiries were sent on foot, and Jackson the ticket taker at the City pier, was directed to attend the directors, and from the inquiries that were made of him, further suspicion was created. Jackson appeared, was allowed to depart at the time, and nothing more was heard of him until six weeks afterwards, when his body was found in the Thames, and from the circumstances of stones being found in his pockets, there was no doubt that he had committed suicide. The defendant Callaghan, it appeared, was the ticket taker at the City pier, and he and Jackson would swear that the ticket which was given to him, he was questioned, and he then made a statement which ultimately led to his apprehension upon the present charge, the effect of that statement being, that ever since 1848 this system of fraud upon the company had been carried on to a very great extent, and as the result the present charge was preferred against the defendants. The evidence against Jeffrey appeared to depend entirely upon the statement made by Callaghan, without any corroboration; and with regard to William Horlock, all that was shown was, that he was in the service of one of the companies, and that he was employed in conveying messages backwards and forwards between the parties.—Evidence having been adduced, the Judge addressed the jury, and expressed an opinion that the charge of conspiracy had not been made out; and under his lordship's direction the jury returned a verdict of "Not Guilty."

ROBBERY.—Jane Griffin, 19, was indicted for stealing a gold watch value £30, and a gold chain value £8, the property of Lester Garland, in the dwelling-house of our lady the Queen.—It appeared from the statement of the case by the counsel for the prosecution that the prosecutor is a lieutenant in the 11th Hussars, and in September last he was stationed with a detachment of his regiment at Hampton Court. The prisoner had been employed in a subordinate capacity to wait upon the officers, and, therefore, had an opportunity of taking the property; but it was admitted that a number of persons had had the watch and chain, and it was like and it was like that she had openly disposed of the watch and chain, and gave her true name and address.—The Recorder having summed up, the jury almost immediately returned a verdict of "Not Guilty."

ROBBERY IN A DWELLING-HOUSE.—Benjamin Davis, aged 20, was indicted for stealing in the dwelling-house of William Layman Cowan, three brooches, valued at £3, his property.—It appeared that the prosecutor, who is secretary to the Shropshire Union Railway Company, resided on the second floor of some chambers, No. 2, Great George-street, Westminster, and the property was stolen from the apartments on the 6th of February.—The evidence being insufficient as to the prisoner's identity, the jury acquitted him.—The prisoner was again indicted for stealing a silver fork, the property of the same prosecutor.—The jury found the prisoner "Guilty" on this charge.—The Common Sergeant sentenced him to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for twelve months.

CHARGE OF EMBEZZLEMENT.—John Gregory, 28, stationer, was indicted for embezzling the sum of £4 1s. the monies of John Thomas Smith and another, his masters.—The jury acquitted the prisoner.

UTTERING A FORGED ACCEPTANCE.—George Lyon, 32, clerk, pleaded "Guilty" to two indictments charging him with uttering a forged bill of exchange, with intent to defraud William Miller Christie and others.—Judgment was postponed.

THE ARGYLE ROBBERY.—This case is postponed until the next sessions, in order to know the result of an indictment removed by *certiorari* to the Queen's Bench.

A WIFE KILLED BY HER HUSBAND.—Alexander Lovey, 43, gunsmith, was indicted for the wilful murder of Charlotte Lovey, his wife, by stabbing her in the neck with a knife. The prisoner by the coroner's inquisition was charged with the offence of manslaughter only.—Mr. Clarkson conducted the prosecution by direction of the court. The prisoner was defended by Mr. Parry, through the humane intervention of the Sheriff.—The learned counsel having briefly opened the case for the prosecution, the following evidence was adduced in support of the charge.—John Woolcot deposed that he lived at No. 15, Crown-court, Whitechapel. He knew the prisoner, who is a gunmaker, and was at work for him on the day when this occurrence happened, in February last. The prisoner and the deceased lived at No. 4, Boars'-Head-court, Whitechapel. On Tuesday, the 19th of February, the deceased went out in the early part of the day. He and the deceased had a quarrel the same evening, and the deceased did not return home until about dusk, and the prisoner then asked her where she had been, and she replied that she had been at her mother's. The prisoner then said if she had been there, they would have a comfortable tea, and he added that he would give her a drop of wine if she would be comfortable with him. The deceased told him to fetch the wine, and the prisoner took a stone bottle and went out as she desired, and he came back with the wine and some meat also—a sweetbread. Deceased took the stone bottle, and poured some of the wine into a tea-cup, and drank it, and while the prisoner was engaged frying the sweetbread, with a knife in his hand, the deceased told him she had been up to the court to get a warrant out against him.

He said with an oath, "You want to wear my life away," and immediately stuck the knife in her, close to her breast and shoulder. He stabbed her once. The deceased cried out "He has stabbed me," and ran into the street. At the time the prisoner stabbed her she was sitting against the fire-place, in a chair. Witness followed the deceased into the street, and saw her taken to a doctor's shop near Petticoat-lane. There was a great deal of blood in the street that had flowed from her person. Witness accompanied a police sergeant back to the prisoner's house, and found him sitting by the fire, in the act of finishing his tea, and witness pointed him to the sergeant, and he took him into custody. He was using the knife he stabbed the deceased with to cut bread, and the sergeant took that away also. There had been a deal of quarrelling between the prisoner and the deceased the same morning, and he saw the latter sharpening the knife in question upon an earthenware pan, and she said she was going to cut her throat. The prisoner said, "Do it," and then took the knife away from her. She was a sober woman.—Mr. Thomas Wyatt deposed that he was house surgeon at the London Hospital, and he remembered the deceased being brought there on the evening of the 19th of February. Upon examining her he ascertained that she was bleeding from a wound on the right side of the neck, and was in a state of partial collapse, and much exhausted. It was a punctured wound, and such a one as would be produced by the knife in the hands of a person of the size of the prisoner. The wound was about three quarters of an inch long, and three inches deep. At first he did not consider that the wound was mortal. The deceased lingered from the 19th to the 27th of February, and then died. Her death was occasioned by inflammation, caused by the wound. Upon a post mortem examination, he found that the gullet had been completely transfixed, and the knife had passed through to the other side, and had passed so close to the carotid artery that its pulsation was visible.—Several witnesses were examined, and a statement made by the deceased was read, which confirmed the evidence already given.—The jury, after deliberating for five minutes, returned their verdict, finding the prisoner "Guilty" of manslaughter.—Mr. Justice Erle ordered the prisoner to stand down, and said he would consider what sentence ought to be pronounced upon him.

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT.—Charles Cartwright, 25, was indicted for feloniously cutting and wounding Daniel May, with intent to resist his lawful apprehension. It appeared that May, who is a City

policeman, was on duty in Ludgate-street on the morning of the 12th of March, in plain clothes, when he saw the prisoner and another man named Judge showing about, and having some knowledge of their character, he watched them, and saw them go to the shop of a tailor named Hayes, in Farringdon-street, where they both handled a coat that was outside and then walked off. They shortly afterwards returned, and Cartwright boldly took down the coat and put it under the one he had on, Judge in the meantime 'covering' him, and they were both about to decamp with their booty when May came up and seized Cartwright, and on an alarm being raised the other prisoner was also secured. The constable was then about to proceed to the police station with Cartwright, who at first went quietly; but just as they got to the Snow-hill end of Farringdon-street, Cartwright stopped and said that if the constable would not let him go he would kill him, and at the same time he drew a clasp knife from his pocket, and inflicted several severe and dangerous cuts upon his hand. The constable, notwithstanding the injuries he had received, still detained one of the prisoners, who was eventually secured and lodged in the police station.—The jury found the prisoner "Guilty" of wounding the prosecutor, with intent to prevent his lawful apprehension.—Cartwright was then charged by another indictment, jointly with the other man, Judge, with the larceny of stealing the coat.—The same facts, with the exception of the wounding of the constable, were put in evidence, and the jury found both prisoners "Guilty."

Baron Patt sent Cartwright to be transported for fifteen years, and Judge was sentenced to be imprisoned for two years.

POST-OFFICE ROBBERY.—Stephenson, 22, a Post-office clerk, was indicted for stealing letters containing money, the property of the Post-master General.—The prisoner, by the advice of his counsel, pleaded "Guilty."—Sentence deferred.

OBTAINING GOODS BY FRAUD.—Richard Price, 42, was indicted for feloniously uttering a forged order for the delivery of a quantity of cloth, value £23, with intent to defraud Messrs. Bull and Co.—The prosecutors are warehousemen carrying on business in St. Martin's-lane, and it appeared that on the 15th of September last an order was presented at the house purporting to come from another firm, Messrs. Boyd and Co., with whom they were in the habit of doing business, requesting that a quantity of a peculiar description of cloth should be sent by the bearer, which was done. The prisoner appeared was not taken into custody until the 28th of March, and he was then positively sworn to as being the person who presented the order. It was also proved that about the time when the forged order was presented, the prisoner had requested a person named Hutton, who was in the service of Messrs. Boyd and Co., to get him a bill head of that firm, saying that he wanted it to decide some wages, and it appeared that the forged order was written upon a paper of this description.—Mr. Cockle endeavoured on behalf of the prisoner to show that the witnesses might have been mistaken as to his identity, and a good character.—The jury, without any hesitation, returned a verdict of "Guilty."—The prisoner, with a dreadful imprecation, declared that he was not the person who presented the order to Messrs. Bull and Co.—Mr. Justice Erle told the prisoner that his conduct was an aggravation of the offence he had committed. The evidence was quite conclusive, and not the slightest doubt could be entertained of his guilt, and but for the good character he had received he should certainly have sentenced him to transportation. He then ordered the prisoner to be kept to hard labour for fifteen months.

THE SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE COLLIERY DISTRICTS.—Informations under the Truck Act were again before the court, and the following cases were heard on Wednesday: the dissatisfaction consequent on the persistence in the "tommy" system seems to be so far ripened, that in all probability there will be full employment for the justices for some time to come. To-day there were new rates for the various collieries; but the rates were so low, that it is difficult to see how they can be maintained. It is quite true that the Truck Acts are explicit enough, but that they are not simple enough to answer all the purposes required is equally clear, inasmuch as the Truck Act, in its present form, does not provide for the penalties, by the ingenuity of lawyers, and the numerous loop-holes afforded for their escape; nevertheless, there seems to be good grounds for the assurance that the system—fraudulent and wrong as it is—will before long be put down. The magistrates on the bench to-day were John Leigh, Esq. (stipendiary), J. Barker, W. Baldwin, W. Foster, C. B. Dimmock, and G. B. Thornycroft, Esqs., and Dr. Dehane.

INFORMATION FOR ILLEGAL CHARGES.—The Messrs. Greenwell are large manufacturers of Tipton, and this county; they have, it seems on their premises, a Tommy shop, and, until a very recent period, their plan has been, through the agency of one Mr. Silver, their pay clerk, to issue cheques for sums under 20s. each to the workmen. On the 29th of March last, a woman named Mrs. Silver, the wife of the pay clerk, was taken into custody, and charged with the offence of issuing cheques for sums under 20s. on account; the sum was paid to her by cheque upon the Dudley and West Bromwich Banking Company, this cheque being, as was well understood, not for presentation at the bank, but at the Tommy shop of Messrs. Greenwell, and the cheques were issued in the name of Hims, whom she received the amount in money, and 2s. 6d. as a bonus. In consequence of this circumstance, an information was laid by the Tipton Anti-Slavery Society, and the charge was brought before the court. It is the intention of the law in the act which provides for the punishment of less than 20s. is illegal. The information was laid under the act of 48 Geo. III., and the facts above set forth were fully proved. On the part of the defendant it was contended by Mr. Joliffe, counsel for the defence, that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the pay clerk, on being called, swore that he had not issued the cheque, and that the cheque issued was not payable to the order of the pay clerk, but was a bill of exchange, and that consequently it was not negotiable and transferable as necessary to bring it within the meaning of the act. It was further contended that no evidence was adduced to prove the existence of a partnership between the Messrs. Greenwell, or that the cheque had been paid by their authority, or with their consent, and upon these technical grounds it was sought to get rid of the information. Silvers, the

MONDAY, APRIL 8.

[illegible]